

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

MEGATEL HOMES, LLC, and ZACH	§	
IPOUR,	§	
	§	
<i>Plaintiffs / Counter-defendants,</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:22-CV-1715-X
	§	
CRYSTAL LAGOONS U.S. CORP.,	§	
	§	
<i>Defendant / Counter-plaintiff.</i>	§	

**AGREED ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFFS’
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Before the Court is the Motion for Protective Order (the “Motion,” Dkt. No. 34) filed by Plaintiffs Megatel Homes, LLC and Zach Ipour (collectively, “Megatel”). As evidenced by the signatures of their counsel below, the parties have agreed to resolve the Motion based on the following agreement between the parties:

- 1) The non-party cities on which Crystal Lagoons U.S. Corp. (“Crystal Lagoons”) has served the discovery subpoenas at issue (each one a “City”) may respond to the discovery requests in the ordinary course.
- 2) For any City producing documents in response to the discovery requests, only Megatel, Megatel’s counsel, and Crystal Lagoons’ counsel may access and review such documents during the period from the date of production until (a) 20 days after production, or (b) 5:00 p.m. on July 21, 2023, whichever is later (the “Review Period”).
- 3) During the Review Period, Megatel may designate material produced by a City as set forth in the Protective Order (Dkt. No. 50), and to the extent Crystal Lagoons disagrees with any

such designation, it may challenge the designation in accordance with the Protective Order.

Crystal Lagoons may seek an expedited determination from the Court if the parties are unable to resolve a dispute about a designation under the Protective Order.

- 4) After the Review Period, Crystal Lagoons may review material produced by a City, including, if applicable, in a manner consistent with the terms of the Protective Order.
- 5) Crystal Lagoons will not file a motion to compel against a City before Friday, July 28, 2023, and during the intervening period, Megatel will continue producing documents responsive to Crystal Lagoons' first set of discovery requests.
- 6) Based on the agreements above, Megatel agrees to withdraw the Motion without prejudice.

Accordingly, it is THEREFORE ORDERED that because it has been withdrawn by Megatel, the Motion is hereby DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

SO ORDERED.

June 28, 2023.



REBECCA RUTHERFORD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE